

УДК 81–115'367.335:[811.161.2+811.111]

V. V. Bogdan

THE SIMILARITY OF FORMAL ARRANGEMENT OF ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPOSITE SENTENCES

This article addresses the question of common and distinctive features of formal structure of adjoining constructions (AC) and composite sentences for the purpose of determining the peculiarities of their functioning. For illustrative purposes, the comparison of a formal arrangement of ACs and composite sentences will mainly be based on complex sentences (CS) which are more demonstrative for our study because they are much more diverse in structural terms than compound ones.

Among the arduous tasks of modern linguistics one of the leading ones is a comprehensive study of text as a maximum unit of language activity. This global problem cannot be solved successfully without conducting research on different text components – their structure, semantics, pragmatics, function and regularities in their connections. Among the most important text units there are two that stand out: composite sentences and adjoining constructions (AC) with adjoining connective words (CW), which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. These composite sentences and ACs are the object of our research.

Despite the great interest of scholars in textual problems, there is a great lack of papers dedicated to the study of ACs and the criteria for their dissociation from composite sentences, the different types of adjoining that exist, as well as parcelling. Nevertheless, modern linguistic research in that direction has made it possible to learn (with the help of a text) those functions and regularities of a language that can only be revealed by the studying of linguistic units in textual segments that are bigger than a sentence [1, c. 17].

The similarity in terms of form, semantics and executable functions between CSs and ACs led to the fact that some researchers did not see much difference between them. We call an AC a two-component text unit divided by an external punctuation mark into two parts that have a fixed position – an autosemantic base utterance (BU) and synsemantic adjoined part (AP). The AP forms a separate sentence that is connected with a BU by a CW, which determines the ease of an AC's syntactic singling out in a text:

(1) "They're here ^{BU}. If ^{CW} you want to ask them anything ^{AP}" (J. Fowles).

The ACs with CWs and CSs are considered as variable units at various syntactic levels (text and sentence levels respectively). In this article, 'variability' is understood in broad terms to mean the ability of language units to change, but not necessarily keep an identical meaning.

Considering grammatical principles of ACs and CSs, linguists point out certain external isomorphism of the syntactic structure of their models

[2, с. 64 – 70; 3, с. 13 – 17], which include: 1) the presence of two parts in their composition (BU + AP) in an AC and the main clause(s) and subordinate clause(s) in a CS that can be characterized by a contact representation, direct or inverted word order; 2) primary function of one part (a BU and main clause) in relation to the other, dependent one (an AP and subordinate clause); 3) the existence of predictable / unpredictable connection in CSs and two classes of ACs that are related to them – «shifted», the parts of which are incompatible in content and cannot form a CS, and those in which an AP is compatible with a BU in the plane of content, and its transformation into a CS is possible; 4) the simplicity of identification of an AP and a subordinate clause in the text due to the presence of an AC in their initial position; 5) the possibility of existence of both units in the form of elementary and non-elementary structures.

The differences between an AC and a CS are seen in: 1) a different type of syntactic relations between the parts of an AC and a CS (adjoining and subordinate respectively). The use of an AP after a long pause focuses attention on it and thus significantly increases both the role of the pause and a pragmatic effect of an AP, which results in: a) the vividness of intonation and abruptness of an AP; b) the acquisition of new meanings and expressiveness by an AP that are not characteristic of a subordinate clause; 2) the impossibility for a CS to have a syntactically dominant or dependent word in the other composite sentence, while such syntactic relations exist between the components of an AC, similar to those relations that exist among formally independent sentences; 3) the existence of both free and fixed part order in a CS and always strictly fixed order in an AC (a BU + an AP) that does not deny (unlike in a CS) the possibility of existence of distant grammatical and semantic relations between the parts of an AC and 4) the impossibility for an AC to be included in the structure of a CS and vice versa, the possibility for a syntactic unit similar to a composite sentence to be the part of an AC structure; 5) punctuation marks between their parts: a comma, a dash, a colon, a semicolon or no punctuation in a CS, and a period, a question mark, an exclamation mark and a stage direction in an AC. The common punctuation mark for both units is three dots. A CW that has strong connecting and anaphoric properties helps to distinguish an AC from adjoining at the sentence level as well as from other units of the text level.

We support the idea that some communicatively important information can be transmitted by both a subordinate clause of a CS and an AP in an AC [4, с. 10; 5, с. 57] and that makes them equal in significance to a main clause / BU. For the first time we have singled out these kinds of APs that are equal in importance to BUs) not only semantically but also formally, i. e. they are structurally integral elements of an AC (*We* in the BU and *We* after the AP are different referents so we cannot remove the AP from the context):

(2) «*We have vowed eternal war against the abominations you mention and their dark masters*^{BU}».

«*As have my own people*^{AP}. *We have our witch-hunts and our laws*»

(W. King).

Observations made with the help of text material reveal both a linear (consecutive) and a parallel adjoining of an AP. A linear adjoining takes place when a BU is closely connected by its content with an AP that consists of one part. At a sentence level we can draw an analogy with a CS with an elementary structure (with one subordinate clause). A parallel adjoining, which is more characteristic of multicomponent APs, correlates to non-elementary CSs (with two or more subordinate clauses).

Taking into consideration the size of the added component (an AP) linguists single out the following variants of it: a) simple ones – word forms (example 3), word combinations (example 4), units structurally similar to elliptical predicative units (example 5), complete predicative unit (example 6) and b) complex ones – with several predicative units in the form of a CS (Example 7) or a sequence of sentences:

(3) *Fine^{BU}. Whatever^{AP}. I just wish I knew what you were talking about* (J. Grisham).

(4) *«As soon as possible», Jeffrey said^{BU}. «As early as tonight^{AP}»* (R. Cook).

(5) *«A great pilot.» Max smiled^{BU}. «Almost as good as me^{AP}»* (J. Higgins).

(6) *The Lord God tested men^{BU}. As He was testing now^{AP}* (R. Ludlum).

(7) *It was of the many skills he wouldn't have acquired had he been a better shot at a sixteen^{BU}. If his shaft hadn't missed the deer and pierced Wolf's shoulder...^{AP}₁ If Cicatrice's band hadn't chosen to lay waste the von Mecklenberg estate...^{AP}₂ If old Baron had employed more men like Vukotish, and less like Schunzel, his then-steward...^{AP}₃ If...^{AP}₄* (J. Yeovil).

Researchers point to the possibility of adjoining being possible after a BU in a syntactic unit of any size up to a composite syntactic unit. Developing this idea, we offer a more detailed classification of multicomponent APs, arranging ACs that have such APs according to the classification of CSs with several subordinate clauses and composite sentences with various types of syntactic relations. ACs with multicomponent APs can have (similar to non-elementary CSs and composite sentences) various types of syntactic relations of different sizes (the number of «sentence parts») and depth of structure (the number of levels of division into parts). Thus, we single out basic ACs (elementary, formally indivisible: BU + CW + AP) and derivative ACs (non-elementary, compound: (BU + CW₁ + AP₁ + CW₂ + AP₂ + CW₃ + AP₃ ... + CW_n + AP_n). Among derivative ACs, we single out the following: 1) APs similar to the consecutive (stage) subordination, 2) APs similar to collateral subordination (homogeneous, heterogeneous and mixed), and 3) ACs with relationships among their different parts similar to those that exist in a composite sentence with various types of syntactic relations. At the same time, the dominant part in relationships between a BU and an AP is the adjoining relationship, and all the other possible ones only 'overlap' it.

The ACs in the following examples are similar to the CSs with homogeneous (example 9), heterogeneous (example 10), and mixed subordination (example 11).

(8) *The raiders didn't know – could not have known – that their target was not at large in the village when they struck^{BU}. That their target had nothing to do with the village^{AP}₁. That their ashes would be dust on the wind before the night was out^{AP}₂* (C. Davidson).

(9) *The second the tape recorder was off, Smith took Thornton aside and pitched a comedy he thought the two of them should do^{BU}. Which is great^{AP}₁. As long as we get 10 per cent^{AP}₂* (Newsweek).

(10) *A sentence is what the speaker means it to mean^{BU}. What he secretly means it to mean^{AP}₁. Which may be quite opposite^{AP}₂. What he doesn't mean it to mean^{AP}₃. What it means as evidence of his real nature^{AP}₄* (J. Fowles).

Another piece of evidence for the existence of universal relationships at different syntactic levels is the example below of an AC with these kinds of relationships among its parts which are the functional equivalent of those in a multicomponent composite sentence with different types of syntactic relationships.

(11) *The next part will be a rave^{BU}. She looked at him, both persuading and estimating. “And on the other hand they live in cynical open worlds^{AP}₁. Bitchy ones^{AP}₂. Where no one really believes anyone else's reputation – especially if they are successful^{AP}₃. Which is all rather healthy, in a way”^{AP}₄* (J. Fowles).

To sum up, we can come to the conclusion that non-elementary ACs with CWs can realize practically all the models of arrangement and all the semantic and syntactic relations that are characteristic of non-elementary CSs. ACs with SWs and composite sentences have equivalent structures, but in the text hierarchy they are on different syntactic levels – a textual and a sentence level respectively.

References

1. **Тураева З. Я.** Лингвистика текста на исходе второго тысячелетия / З. Я. Тураева // Вісник Київськ. лінгв. ун-ту. – 1999. – № 2. – Т. 2. – С. 17 – 25.
2. **Богдан В. В.** Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англомовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком : [монографія] / В. В. Богдан. – Донецьк : ЛАНДОН-XXI, 2011. – 263 с.
3. **Ринберг В. Л.** Конструкции связного текста в современном русском языке / В. Л. Ринберг. – Львов : Вища школа, 1987. – 168 с.
4. **Дмитренко В. А.** Структура, семантика и функции союзных форм связи в смысловых миниатюрах в современном английском языке / В. А. Дмитренко // Вісник Харківськ. нац. ун-ту. Сер. : романо-германська філологія. – 2002. – № 572. – С. 87 – 93.
5. **Коцюбовська Г. А.** Приєднувальні конструкції: функціонально-текстовий аспект : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01 / Галина Анатолівна Коцюбовська. – Дніпропетровськ, 2002. – 188 с.

Богдан В. В. Подібність формальної структури приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень

У роботі розглянуті схожі й відмінні, облігаторні й факультативні риси формальної організації приєднувальних конструкцій і складних

речень. Розширена класифікація приєднувальних частин у приєднувальних конструкціях, запропоновані критерії відмежування приєднувальних конструкцій від інших складних синтаксичних одиниць. Зроблено висновок про еквівалентність різнорівневих одиниць – приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень – з погляду їхніх стройових основ.

Ключові слова: приєднувальна конструкція, базове висловлення, приєднувальна частина, приєднувальний сполучниковий засіб.

Богдан В. В. Сходство формальной структуры присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений

В работе рассмотрены схожие и отличные, облигаторные и факультативные черты формальной организации присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений. Расширенная классификация присоединительных частей в присоединительных конструкциях, предложены критерии отграничения присоединительных конструкций от других сложных синтаксических единиц. Сделан вывод об эквивалентности разноуровневых единиц – присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений – с точки зрения их строевых основ.

Ключевые слова: присоединительная конструкция, базовое высказывание, присоединительная часть, присоединительное союзное средство.

Bogdan V. V. The Similarity of Formal Arrangement of Adjoining Constructions and Composite Sentences

The paper focuses on similar and distinctive, obligatory and optional peculiarities of the formal organization of adjoining constructions (with the parts (the base utterance and the adjoined part) connected by the adjoining conjunctions that are homonymous to subordinate ones)) and composite sentences. On the material of Modern English the criteria for dissociation of adjoining constructions from complex sentences are offered; formal and syntactic properties of the adjoining constructions are added and specified; the classification of their adjoined parts is expanded. The adjoined parts similar to the consecutive (stage) subordination, collateral subordination (homogeneous, heterogeneous and mixed) and with relationships among the parts similar to those that exist in a composite sentence with various types of syntactic relations are singled out. Structurally, the adjoining constructions and composite sentences are considered to be equivalent units at different syntactic levels.

Key words: adjoining construction, base utterance, adjoined part, adjoining conjunction.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.02.2013 р.

Прийнято до друку 30.05.2013 р.

Рецензент – д. філол. н., проф. Харлан О. Д.